

people. Nor would I restrict the right of an employer to lock out his employees under such circumstances.

It seems to me that in seeking the dividing line between disputes where strikes and lockouts are to be allowed and those where they are to be prohibited, one might say that if the industry or service is of such public importance that it is regulated by the Public Utilities Commission in the provincial field or the Board of Transport Commissioners in the federal field, then that industry or service is of such importance to the public that strikes and lockouts should be illegal, and that any differences which cannot be settled amicably should be settled by compulsory arbitration or, better still, by a labour court set up for the sole purpose of dealing with labour disputes. The term "compulsory arbitration" is offensive to many people, and yet the term "binding conciliation," which is only another way of saying the same thing, has been accepted by the police and fire unions for many years without any suggestion having been made that their members have suffered in any way as a result of being denied the right to strike.

As far as the dispute which ties up the C.P.R. ships is concerned, it is my specific suggestion that Parliament should take immediate action to extend the period of the collective agreement between the C.P.R. and the S.I.U. until such time as the parties can agree upon the terms of a new collective agreement. This course was successfully followed by a previous administration when both our transcontinental railways went on strike, and the railways began to run in a matter of a few days.

I do not assert that the C.P.R. is right and the S.I.U. is wrong in the contract negotiations. I do not assert that either party has shown less than the best of faith in the collective bargaining. But I do assert that they are both wrong when the result of their action is irreparable damage to the general public.

I do not believe that the Government is getting any comfort out of the fact that a lot of people in British Columbia are suffering heavy losses. Neither do I believe that this Government is foolish enough to allow this strike to continue indefinitely when the Government itself stands to suffer heavy losses during its continuance. But I do believe, along with the masses in British Columbia, that the Government has utterly failed to take this situation seriously. As evidence of this lack of interest, I would remind you that there are 18 Government members—including three ministers—from British Columbia and they have shown no appreciable interest. I should not be urging them to do their homework but, on behalf of British Columbia, I do earnestly do so. I have

full confidence that the Government is going to face up to this problem sooner or later. I earnestly urge it to make it sooner. I most sincerely hope that the honourable the Leader of the Government in this house (Hon. Mr. Aseltine) will exert the full weight of his good offices on his Government to take some definite, effective and immediate action to bring this strike to an end.

Hon. Mr. Lambert: Would the honourable gentleman permit me to ask just one question? Would he tell us what the precise issue is between the parties to this strike he has referred to? If he has already explained this I failed to hear him.

Hon. Mr. Smith (Kamloops): The Seafarers' International Union was asking for an increase of 25 per cent in wages. The C.P.R. had offered them an increase of 8 per cent. While the negotiations were going on the company settled with another union involving 700 employees on the same boats, who belonged to the Clerks' Union, for an increase of 8 per cent.

Hon. J. W. Comeau: Honourable senators, I wish to join with the other honourable senators who have spoken, in offering my sincere congratulations to the Honourable Speaker of the Senate, and also to the Honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Aseltine) and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Macdonald). I am not going to expose their virtues, because I think it would be superfluous. The honourable senator from De la Durantaye (Hon. Mr. Pouliot) did it very well with respect to the Honourable Leader of the Government this afternoon; so I will proceed with the few remarks I have to make. They have to do with what I know will be a very dry subject for most senators, for I want to say a few words about one branch of the fisheries of the Maritime provinces. With the leave of the Senate I would like to read an excerpt from the *Halifax Chronicle-Herald* of June 5, bearing the caption "Fisheries Scientists in Session":

Scientists engaged in fisheries research in various parts of the world are comparing notes in Halifax this week—in conjunction with the meeting of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries which opens in Halifax on Monday.

The biologists and marine research experts began their talks and panel discussions yesterday at the administration building of Dalhousie University.

Representatives of 11 of the 12 member-countries of the Commission were in attendance. Russia, the latest country to join the convention, was not represented at the opening-day meetings but the U.S.S.R. delegates are expected to arrive today.

Dr. Lionel Walford, Washington, D.C., chief of the Atlantic Oceanographic Fisheries Research Centre of U.S. Commercial Fisheries, is presiding over the meetings.